### IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS MARSHALL DIVISION

| GEOTAG, INC.,                | § |                     |
|------------------------------|---|---------------------|
|                              | § |                     |
| Plaintiff,                   | § |                     |
|                              | § | No. 2:12-cv-404-MHS |
| v.                           | § |                     |
|                              | § | JURY TRIAL DEMANDED |
| EYE CARE CENTERS OF AMERICA, | § |                     |
| INC., et al.,                | § |                     |
|                              | § |                     |
| Defendants.                  | § |                     |

# GEOTAG, INC.'S RESPONSE TO DEFENDANT VISIONWORKS OF AMERICA INC.'S NOTICE OF JOINDER IN DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO STAY

Plaintiff GeoTag, Inc. ("GeoTag") hereby responds to Defendant Visionworks of America Inc.'s ("Visionworks") Notice of Joinder in Defendants' Motion to Stay filed on June 4, 2012, Dkt. No. 308, as follows.

Defendant Visionworks requests the Court stay this action in favor of the declaratory judgment action filed by Microsoft and Google pending in Delaware. Visionworks does not present any evidence or argument explaining how the Delaware litigation would resolve GeoTag's claims against it in this litigation. Instead, Visionworks relies entirely on the arguments previously made to the Court by other defendants in other actions. But none of those arguments even suggested that the Delaware litigation could resolve all or even most of the issues regarding GeoTag's claims against Visionworks. Indeed, Visionworks does not present any evidence or argument that GeoTag's claims against it share any common issues with the Delaware litigation.

This Court in *Levine v. Casio America Inc.*, Civil Action No. 2:11-cv-00056-MHS (E.D. Tex. May 2, 2012) recently denied a motion stay for similar reasons. In that lawsuit, the Court

declared that, "[a]lthough some issues may be resolved in [the other pending lawsuit], the Court is unpersuaded that the resolution of that case would entirely resolve the instant matter. Ultimately, judicial economy would be better served by allowing both cases to proceed contemporaneously." *Id.* at 3. The same is true in this case.

For the foregoing reasons, the Court should deny Visionworks' motion.

Dated: June 18, 2012 Respectfully submitted,

#### **BUETHER JOE & CARPENTER, LLC**

By: /s/ Eric W. Buether

Eric W. Buether

State Bar No. 03316880

Eric.Buether@BJCIPLaw.com

Christopher M. Joe

State Bar No. 00787770

Chris.Joe@BJCIPLaw.com

Brian A. Carpenter

State Bar No. 03840600

Brian.Carpenter@BJCIPLaw.com

Monica Tavakoli

State Bar No. 24065822

Monica.Tavakoli@BJCIPLaw.com

Mark D. Perantie

State Bar No. 24053647

Mark.Perantie@BJCIPLaw.com

Niky Bukovcan

State Bar No. 24078287

Niky.Bukovcan@BJCIPLaw.com

1700 Pacific Avenue

Suite 4750

Dallas, Texas 75201

Telephone: (214) 466-1271 Facsimile: (214) 635-1827

## NI LAW FIRM, PLLC

Hao Ni State Bar No. 24047205 hni@nilawfirm.com

3102 Maple Avenue Suite 400 Dallas, Texas 75201

Telephone: (214) 800-2208 Facsimile: (214) 800-2209

ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF GEOTAG, INC.

## **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

The undersigned hereby certifies that all counsel of record who are deemed to have consented to electronic service are being served with a copy of this document via the Court's CM/ECF system per Local Rule CV-5(a) on this 18th day of June, 2012. Any other counsel of record will be served by facsimile transmission.

/s/ Eric W. Buether

Eric W. Buether